



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/904,860	08/01/1997	HIROKAZU OHI	1232-4367	4593
7590	10/03/2005		EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER E CHALSEN MORGAN AND FINNEGAN 345 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10154			DINH, DUNG C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/904,860	OHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dung Dinh	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20, 23-34 and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20, 23-34, 41-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/19, 9/13, 9/14/05</u> . (5 pages) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/22/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 23-26, 30-31, 41, 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. "Beyond the Web: Excavating the Real World via Mosaic"

As per claim 23, Goldberg teaches a server controlling a camera in accordance to request from a remote client and transmitting image obtained by the camera to the remote client based on communication rule of a general network, comprising:

receptions means for receiving the request (see page 5, server A);

processing means for performing control processing of the camera based on the request (server C);

transfer means for transferring image information obtained by the processing means to the client (see page 6 2nd paragraph);

wherein the transfer means transfer the image information with information indicating of a service allowable range of the camera (see page 3, the schematic picture of the robot workspace showing allowable range within which the robot arm can move to).

As per claim 24, Goldberg teaches providing information of camera control right (page. 4 see "Access to the Robot").

As per claim 25, Goldberg teaches indicating the limitation of image sensing direction of a camera (see fig on page 3. The schematic picture indicates the range of the robot arm. Since the

Art Unit: 2152

camera is tied to the robot arm, the range limitation of the arm is also the range limitation of the camera).

As per claim 26, Goldberg teaches transmitting via HTTP (see page 3).

As per claims 30 and 31, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 23 above.

As per claims 41, 43 and 44, Goldberg teaches wherein the request including an identifier for identifying an item to be controlled of the camera (the coordinate to move to).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11-18, 20, 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yohanan US patent 5,737,560 and further in view of WebCam+ and IBM TDB NN9605149 "Mapping Protocol Requests to Uniform Resource Locators".

As per claim 1 and 11, Yohanan teaches a communication method comprising:

storing a network address [URL - host domain address] of an object site [web page] into memory;

storing control information [URL - remainder of the URL information] at a location remote from the object site. [see fig.2 and col.5 lines 41-51, col.6 lines 10-15].

reading the address and control information stored and accessing said designated site using the address and control information [col. 2 lines 35-41],

Yohanan teaches a 'jumpsite' icon with stored URL that permits quick access to a specific site on the Internet. Yohanan does not specifically disclose the site being an image input device. Accessing and controlling an image input device over the Internet is known at the time of the invention.

WebCam+ is a Web based remote control camera system. The system has a web browser form for entering control information for controlling the camera's position and zoom remotely over the Internet and deliver captured image via a web page [see WebCam+ page 2]. The IBM TDB discloses method of providing control information as part of the URL including identifier for identifying an item to be controlled (<operation>, <parameters>).

Art Unit: 2152

Hence, given the teaching of Yohanan, WebCam+, and the IMB TDB, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a 'jumpsite' containing the network address and control information for a remote camera device because it would have alleviated manual parameters input and enabled one to quickly command the remote camera via a browser interface.

As per claims 2 and 12, Yohanan teaches the address is a URL on the Internet. [see fig.2 and col.5 lines 41-51].

As per claims 3 and 13, the WebCam+ teaches displaying received image information from said site.

As per claims 4 and 14, Yohanan teaches generating control information according to manual designation [see fig.2 and col.5 lines 41-51].

As per claims 5 and 15, the WebCam+ teaches inputting moving image (see page 1 - images are captured every minute).

As per claims 6 and 16, WebCam+ teaches the input means is a video camera.

As per claims 7-8 and 17-18, WebCam+ teaches controlling focal distance (zoom) and sensing angle (X,Y,Z).

As per claims 10 and 20, it is apparent that the system as modified would have computer program readably stored for performing the process of claims 1 and 11.

Art Unit: 2152

As per claims 47-48 and 50-51, The IBM TDB teaches expressing the identifier is express as part of the path name and resource name in the URL (see page 1 <operation>/ <context>? <parameters>).

As per claims 49 and 52, Yohanan does not teach the control information is stored separately from the address. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art in the system as modified to store the control information separately from the address because it would have enable multiple saved control information to be associated with one address (i.e. providing multiple saved commands & parameters for each camera).

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yohanan US patent 5,737,560 and further in view of WebCam+ and IBM TDB NN9605149 "Mapping Protocol Requests to Uniform Resource Locators" and Sergeant US patent 5,517,236.

As per claims 9 and 19, The WebCam+ article does not specifically disclose controlling shutter speed of the video camera. Camera with shutter speed control is well known in the art at the time of the invention. In the art of video camera control, Sergeant teaches the surveillance unit is a video camera. Sergeant teaches angle sensor [col.7 lines 45-50],

Art Unit: 2152

controlling the camera focal distance [col.8 line 52] and shutter speed [col.11 line 2]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide shutter speed control it would have improved the system by enabling a user to fully control the camera functionalities.

Claims 23-34, 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackshear US patent 5,111,288 and further in view of WebCam+, and Niwa US patent 5,544,046.

As per claims 23, and 30-34, Blackshear teaches a camera control system comprising:

reception means for receiving request of sensing condition of the camera; and processing means for performing control processing of the camera based on the request [col.6 lines 6-22, col.9 lines 12-20];

transfer means for transferring image information obtained by the processing means with status of the camera [col.9 lines 12-20: "azimuth and elevation coordinates in degree"].

Blackshear does not teach the system being a server controlling a camera according to request from remote a client over a general network.

Art Unit: 2152

WebCam+ is a Web based remote control camera. The system has an web browser form for entering controlling command for controlling the camera's position and zoom remotely over the Internet and deliver capture image via a web page [see page 2 "WebCam + Is Born ..."]. The system improved the prior art by enabling remote control the camera via the Internet using a browser at a client computer.

Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Web technology as show by the WebCam+ teaching to the system of BlackShear because it would have enabled accessing and controlling the system over the Internet.

Blackshear does not specially disclose returning information indicating service allowable range of the camera.

Niwa teaches to store service allowable range of a device (tolerance limits) so as to let the system ensure that the user input of control parameters are within appropriate range and warn the user of any error [see fig.49, col.26 lines 18-26]. Given the teaching of Niwa, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit service allowable range of the camera to the client because it would have improved the system by enabling the user to know the appropriate parameters for

Art Unit: 2152

commanding the camera and enable the client system to check for errors prior to submitting the command to the server.

As per claim 24, the reference does not disclose control right. It would have been obvious to have control right in the system as modified so as to provide access security and to regulate requests from multiple users.

As per claim 25, Blackshear disclose showing the sensing direction of the camera [col.9 lines 12-20: "azimuth and elevation coordinates in degree"]. Hence, it is apparent that the system as modified would show service allowable range for the sensing direction of the camera.

As per claim 26-29, since the Blackshear system is modified by WebCam+ to operate over the Internet. Is apparent that the processing would be done via HTTP message. It is well known in the art HTTP message passes request parameters in the header [GET] or the body of the message [POST]. See RFC 1866 pp.46-47 section 8.2.2 and 8.2.3. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide control parameter range in the HTTP message send to the remote client because it would have enable the client to verify the commands before sending to the camera control server.

As per claims 41-46, Blackshear teaches user controllable tilt, pan, zoom and focus. Hence, it is apparent that the request

Art Unit: 2152

would have identifiers to identify items for controlling the camera [tilt and pan X-Y movement, zoom, focus, etc.]

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (571) 272-3949.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
September 21, 2005